

Date: Fri, 27 May 94 04:30:15 PDT
From: Ham-Policy Mailing List and Newsgroup <ham-policy@ucsd.edu>
Errors-To: Ham-Policy-Errors@UCSD.Edu
Reply-To: Ham-Policy@UCSD.Edu
Precedence: Bulk
Subject: Ham-Policy Digest V94 #224
To: Ham-Policy

Ham-Policy Digest Fri, 27 May 94 Volume 94 : Issue 224

Today's Topics:

 Code test speeds (4 msgs)
 Code test speeds (question)
 CW speed? When will the wingers stop ?? (2 msgs)
 Not Again (2 msgs)

Send Replies or notes for publication to: <Ham-Policy@UCSD.Edu>
Send subscription requests to: <Ham-Policy-REQUEST@UCSD.Edu>
Problems you can't solve otherwise to brian@ucsd.edu.

Archives of past issues of the Ham-Policy Digest are available
(by FTP only) from UCSD.Edu in directory "mailarchives/ham-policy".

We trust that readers are intelligent enough to realize that all text
herein consists of personal comments and does not represent the official
policies or positions of any party. Your mileage may vary. So there.

Date: Thu, 26 May 1994 05:06:40 GMT
From: ihnp4.ucsd.edu!library.ucla.edu!europa.eng.gtefsd.com!news.msfc.nasa.gov!
news.larc.nasa.gov!lerc.nasa.gov!kira.cc.uakron.edu!malgudi.oar.net!witch!ted!
mjsilva@network.ucsd.edu
Subject: Code test speeds
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In article <052494063338Rnf0.78@amcomp.com>, Dan Pickersgill (dan@amcomp.com)
writes:

>Jeff, there are more CW QSO's because the mode is so greatly INefficient
>that its thruput requires half the avaiiable spectrum to communicate what
>could be done on other modes in a tenth the space/time.
>

Now this is just silly talk. There are *more* CW QSO's because it is
such an inefficient mode! Does this mean that CW useage has
increased as other "more efficient" modes have been developed? I'd
like to see that graph, starting at near zero around 1910, rising
steadily until about 1980, and then exploding off the page!

I think the fact that so many hams use code when they don't have to is the elephant in the parlor for the anti-coders. They don't understand how it came to be there, they don't understand why it won't go away, so they'll just ignore it if you will. The reason is not that CW has so brain-damaged these folks that they no longer realize how backwards and outmoded they are, and neither is the answer that they just like to have fun with this quaint old mode, kind of like molding your own musket balls. Many hams use CW because of the very real benefits of increased range, reduced interference and lower equipment cost and complexity.

Mike, KK6GM

Date: Thu, 26 May 1994 20:33:27 GMT
From: brunix!pstc3!md@uunet.uu.net
Subject: Code test speeds
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In article <277@ted.win.net>, mjsilva@ted.win.net (Michael Silva) writes:

|> Now this is just silly talk. There are *more* CW QSO's because it is
|> such an inefficient mode! Does this mean that CW useage has
|> *increased* as other "more efficient" modes have been developed? I'd
|> like to see that graph, starting at near zero around 1910, rising
|> steadily until about 1980, and then exploding off the page!

One cannot coorelate the number of QSOs to a mode's "efficiency". In fact, I'd say just the opposite - if CW were so inefficient, then why would so many people use it to communicate? If there are on average 1000 CW QSOs, and 500 QSOs, in their respective band portions on a given night, its not possible to conclude that there are more QSOs in CW because it is "less efficient".

I would contend that you may be able to link efficiency to the length of an average QSO (i.e. a CW QSO takes 50% longer) - however, in this case, you also need to take into account bandwidth usage. For example, if the average CW QSO uses 500hz of bandwidth and lasts 5 minutes, that QSO has roughly the same amount of efficiency that a 1 minute 2.4khz SSB QSO does (2500 hertz-minutes verses 2400 hertz-minutes). Yes, it takes 5 times longer, but you can also fit 5 times the number of QSOs in the same amount of spectrum that a single SSB contact would take.

If you want truely efficient communications, then I would contend that we should also eliminate SSB and go to straight 9600bps digitized speech

packet bursts.

MD

--

-- Michael P. Deignan
-- RI Center For Political Incorrectness & Environment Ignorance
-- Gasoline: Waste all you want. We'll refine more.

Date: 26 May 1994 21:31:05 GMT
From: ihnp4.ucsd.edu!swrinde!cs.utexas.edu!howland.reston.ans.net!
europa.eng.gtefsd.com!newsxfer.itd.umich.edu!zip.eecs.umich.edu!panix!ddsw1!
news.kei.com!ssd.intel.com!chnews!cmoore@network.
Subject: Code test speeds
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

Michael P. Deignan (md@maxcy2.maxcy.brown.edu) wrote:

: If you want truly efficient communications, then I would contend that
: we should also eliminate SSB and go to straight 9600bps digitized speech
: packet bursts. -- Michael P. Deignan

Michael, what equipment are you using to send 9600bps digitized speech
in real time under fading HF conditions that takes less than 2.5 KHz
bandwidth?

73, KG7BK, CecilMoore@delphi.com

Date: 26 May 1994 21:26:01 GMT
From: ihnp4.ucsd.edu!swrinde!gatech!news-feed-1.peachnet.edu!news.duke.edu!eff!
news.kei.com!ssd.intel.com!chnews!cmoore@network.ucsd.edu
Subject: Code test speeds
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

Michael Silva (mjsilva@ted.win.net) wrote:

: Many hams use CW because of the very real benefits of increased
: range, reduced interference and lower equipment cost and complexity.
: Mike, KK6GM

Exactly what I have been doing for 40 years, Mike, but I don't believe
in stuffing it down anybody else's throat. CW is not a God, it is just
a mode. How would you like it if only members of MENSA were allowed to
be hams? IQ is more important to amateur radio than CW, wouldn't you

agree?

73, KG7BK, CecilMoore@delphi.com

Date: Thu, 26 May 1994 21:05:51 GMT
From: ihnp4.ucsd.edu!swrinde!gatech!howland.reston.ans.net!news.cac.psu.edu!
news.pop.psu.edu!ra!usenet@network.ucsd.edu
Subject: Code test speeds (question)
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

Just out of curiosity, what are the code requirements to obtain an amateur radio license in other countries? Here in the US it's 5, 13, and 20 wpm. What are they in, say, Great Britain, Canada, France, Togo, etc.?

-Dave

David Drumheller, KA3QBQ phone: (202) 767-3524
Acoustics Division, Code 7140 fax: (202) 404-7732
Naval Research Laboratory
Washington, DC 20375-5350 e-mail: drumhell@claudette.nrl.navy.mil

Date: 26 May 94 08:19:58 EDT
From: ihnp4.ucsd.edu!library.ucla.edu!europa.eng.gtefsd.com!
newsxfer.itd.umich.edu!jobone!lynx.unm.edu!pacs.sunbelt.net!
DDEPEW%CHM.TEC.SC.US@network.ucsd.edu
Subject: CW speed? When will the wingers stop ??
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In article <1994May26.005043.31522@ucl.ac.uk>, zcap134@ucl.ac.uk (Redvers Llewellyn Davies) writes:

> There are four good reasons why the CW cannot be abolished.
>
>1) It is required by international treaty.
>2) Over 50% of HF traffic is CW and it is better to be bi-lingual.
>3) Some kind of filtering system is needed to slow down the stream of
> people going onto HF.
>
> and... Most importantly...
>
>4) I HAD TO DO IT AND SO YOU CAN SUFFER TOO!!!!
>
>
> Being serious for a moment though, the way I look at this is this.
>The blurb on my licence says that my station is for "... the self-education of

>the licensee for the establishment..." Blah... etc. IE: The idea being that
>the amateur system was for radio training.
>
> Now, hands up all these people who use their calls for research, or
>self-training...???

>
> Originally to get a UK licence you needed a plan of research. This
>would then be approved or thrown out. How many people would qualify for that?

>
> Now, the only REAL barrier is CW. People state that CW is un-needed.
>Fine, why don't we abolish the radio theory exam too, I mean, who needs radio
>theory to operate one of these new "Black-Box" radios???

>
> Do you see my point?? It is just a case of people who cannot be
>bothered to make an effort. If someone is unwilling to make the effort to
>learn CW to 13wpm (US speed I think?) then they do not DESERVE to use HF. It
>is a sacrifice of time, a show of determination. If, after doing the test you
>decide you never want to see another key again... Good for you. I will
>respect you for putting the EFFORT in.

>
> Good Luck, 73.
>
> Red, GW0TJO.
>
>zcap134@ucl.ac.uk
>
>P.S. Morse is my mode, but I would never have made the effort to learn it if I
>didn't have to. Hands up any CW ops who would have learned it if they didn't
>have to. I didn't think so :).
>
>
Red,

I agree completely. CW is a "gatekeeper" for ham radio, and in order to keep the hobby from getting corrupted we need to keep it, along with the theory tests. But, as you mentioned, CW is also a lot of fun...and sometimes it's the only mode that will get through. There's something in ham radio for everyone, and I think it's fine to have a no-code tech (although when I was a tech I had to do 5wpm) - but we really need to keep CW in order to maintain what little sanity there is left on the HF bands (80 M phone may already be a lost cause..hi hi!)

Thanks and 73

Dorr
N4QIX

Date: Thu, 26 May 1994 16:38:44 GMT
From: ihnp4.ucsd.edu!library.ucla.edu!europa.eng.gtefsd.com!
howland.reston.ans.net!spool.mu.edu!uwm.edu!mixcom.com!
kevin.jessup@network.ucsd.edu
Subject: CW speed? When will the wingers stop ??
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In <1994May26.081958.1002@pacs.sunbelt.net> ddepew@CHM.TEC.SC.US writes:

>- but we really need to keep CW in order
>to maintain what little sanity there is left on the HF bands

If THAT is what passes for sanity, then I am giving up amateur radio.
This hobby is no longer concerned with advancing the state of the
radio art. I doubt if it ever was.

```
--  
/`- _      kevin.jessup@mixcom.com | Vote Libertarian!  
{      }/ |  
 \      /      N9SQB, ARRL, Amateur Radio | Call 1-800-682-1776  
|__*|      N9SQB @ WA9POV.#MKE.WI.USA.NA | for more information.
```

Date: 26 May 94 13:13:14 GMT
From: news-mail-gateway@ucsd.edu
Subject: Not Again
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

>Kind of deja vu on this group. Be away from it for a little and then
>logged on to catch up. Low and behold apparently the only "policy" issues are
>the code speeds. Almost the same people responding with the same
>opinions, voiced the same way. Seems a little boring.

probably. this time around, the manufacturers are calling for a drop in code
speeds to spur sales of higher margin HF radios than the low-margin VHF HTs.

Be interesting if they are successful with this approach.

bill wb9ivr

Date: Thu, 26 May 1994 13:39:46 GMT
From: ihnp4.ucsd.edu!usc!howland.reston.ans.net!europa.eng.gtefsd.com!emory!
cs.utk.edu!stc06r.CTD.ORNL.GOV!ornl!xdepc.eng.ornl.gov!wyn@network.ucsd.edu

Subject: Not Again
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

>From: Erich Franz Stocker <stocker@spsosun.gsfc.nasa.gov>>Newsgroups:
rec.radio.amateur.policy>Subject: Not Again>Date: 25 May 1994 10:51:32 GMT
>Organization: NASA/GSFC TSDIS Code 902.3
>Lines: 30
>Distribution: world
>Message-ID: <2rvajk\$4p1@paperboy.gsfc.nasa.gov>
>NNTP-Posting-Host: trmmstocker.gsfc.nasa.gov
>Mime-Version: 1.0
>Content-Type: text/plain; charset=US-ASCII
>Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit
>X-Newsreader: Nuntius Version 1.2
>X-XXMessage-ID: <AA08A70A6C0114D6@trmmstocker.gsfc.nasa.gov>
>X-XXDate: Wed, 25 May 1994 11:56:10 GMT

>Kind of deja vu on this group. Be away from it for a little and then
>logged
>on to catch up. Low and behold apparently the only "policy" issues are
>the code speeds. Almost the same people responding with the same
>opinions, voiced the same way. Seems a little boring.

>Just as a change of pace!

> Considerable concern has been expressed
>by some in the ham community that we are in danger of losing
>spectrum. I believe that since the majority of hams are only
>interested in working HF and that since the HF bands are not of
>real interest to the spectrum gobblers that we should just let the
>government auction off all ham (primary and secondary) spectrum above
>1.2GHz (maybe just leave a little band for mode S work).

>Not many hams are really interested in these frequencies (except that
>it is considered sacreligious to advocate giving up Ham allotments
>whether used or unused) so why not auction them to commercial
>interests to help pay off some of the national debt.

>*****
>* Erich Franz Stocker *
>* N30XM *
>* stocker@spsosun.gsfc.nasa.gov *
>* *
>* My ideas are my own and do not represent*
>* the opinions of the federal government, *
>* NASA or Goddard Space Flight Center. *
>*****

73,
C. C. (Clay) Wynn N4A0X
wyn@ornl.gov

• • • — • • • • • — • — — • • — • • • — — • • — • • — • — — • • • • • — • — —

```
In article <Q8BI1.4Jx@news.hawaii.edu>,
Jeffrey Herman <jherman@uhunix3.uhcc.Hawaii.Edu> wrote:
>In article <31326Rnf0.78@amcomp.com> dan@amcomp.com (Dan Pickersgill) writes.
>>
> I go away for 2 months and return and still see the same weak arguments
>against the code. Thus, I will give the same strong arguments for code:
>
>Coast Guard Radioman School took in folks who had no background in code or
>radio. After 5 months 95% of these people graduated as USCG Radiomen with
>a code speed of 22 wpm. The 5% failure rate was due to:
>* discipline problems (military life isn't for everyone)
>* repeatedly failing a particular block exam (radio fundamentals, code, etc)
>
>So MORE THAN 95% were able to learn code.
```


Ability to learn code, or anything else, is not a valid justification to test for code proficiency.

>Prospective hams who can't learn the code should either put more effort
>into it, get the no-code license, or choose another aspect of the
>radio hobby (11M or 1750M, or shortwave listening), or just choose another
>hobby.

Why should one mode of operation be a pass/fail gateway to the many other modes of operation? It is only CW that is afforded such a privileged position in the testing process. If, as has been stated, CW is used regularly by 38% of hams, then it doesn't even constitute a majority of the ham population as to such usage.

>It seems that up until the invention of the radio newsgroups on USENET
>no one complained about learning the code to get a license. I can't recall
>reading ANY letters to the editor in QST in the 60's or 70's about anyone
>whinning about the code.

Well, thanks be to USENET, as this is the only medium that provides the immediate ability to hold such discussions before a rather large audience of hams where each and everyone can provide input. Letters to the editor in CQ magazine, QST and other publications simply don't generate the responsive interaction found in USENET.

>What is it about USENET that makes people so mentally and physically lazy?

That is a totally false assumption and one that seems to be raised as another weak argument against those that suggest lowering CW requirements.

>>You can, I can, does NOT mean EVERYONE can.

>

>More than 95% can.

If the testing element is not significantly relevant to the privileges being gained by the license, then it makes no difference that 95% or even a 100% could study and pass if they spent the time and effort doing so.

>I wanted to be a commercial pilot but I couldn't pass the eye exam; I took
>up sailing instead. Should I petition the FAA to delete the eye exam?
>Certainly not. Just accept your weaknesses and do something else.

We are (1) not talking about commercial licenses, (2) the FAA requirement is a direct function of public safety and (3) you could still have gone for a private license.

CW proficiency should not be a pass/fail testing element. CW should be afforded the same testing that any other mode is tested for today. That can be done by merging the CW test with the written test and arriving at a combined test score which would require 75% correct answers...BUT I'll bet the pro-Code folks wouldn't even consider that because it takes away the CW filter.

>Computers can translate so why do we still see people learning foreign
>languages? You probably see that as a waste of time.

If I choose to live in a foreign country, I can learn the language, BUT I don't have to learn the language to go there. Likewise, IF someday I choose to operate CW, I'll just go off and do it, starting in the novice subbands. Maybe no one will hold a QSO with me, but that'd be my problem.

Again, as I've said in other posts, I have no opposition to a high speed (i.e. 13 or 20wpm) requirement if, and only if, that test is to only gain use of high speed CW subbands, BUT when I must learn 20wpm to use the Extra Class voice subbands, that's unjustifiable.

Standard Disclaimer- Any opinions, etc. are mine and NOT my employer's.

Bill Sohl (K2UNK) BELLCORE (Bell Communications Research, Inc.)
Morristown, NJ email via UUCP bcr!cc!whs70
201-829-2879 Weekdays email via Internet whs70@cc.bellcore.com

Date: Thu, 26 May 1994 19:37:48 GMT
From: ihnp4.ucsd.edu!usc!howland.reston.ans.net!spool.mu.edu!sgiblab!brunix!pstc3!
md@network.ucsd.edu
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <1994May26.005043.31522@ucl.ac.uk>,
<1994May26.081958.1002@pacs.sunbelt.net>,
<1994May26.163844.2422@mixcom.mixcom.com>
Subject : Re: CW speed? When will the wingers stop ??

In article <1994May26.163844.2422@mixcom.mixcom.com>,
kevin jessup <kevin.jessup@mixcom.mixcom.com> writes:

|> This hobby is no longer concerned with advancing the state of the
|> radio art. I doubt if it ever was.

Where have you been. We're not interested in advancing the state of the radio art, we're simply interested in increasing the number of amateurs

(to sell more upgrade materials, ARRL memberships, and oh, "protecting spectrum (cough, gasp, wheeze)).

I don't know if advancing is a valid concern of the amateur service anymore anyway. Electronics technology today is filled with surface mount tech and custom ICs. Not much amateurs can do in those areas.

MD

--

-- Michael P. Deignan
-- RI Center For Political Incorrectness & Environment Ignorance
-- 'Have you hugged your chainsaw today?'

Date: Thu, 26 May 1994 21:12:13 GMT
From: ihnp4.ucsd.edu!swrinde!gatech!howland.reston.ans.net!news.moneng.mei.com!
uwm.edu!mixcom.com!kevin.jessup@network.ucsd.edu
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <1994May26.081958.1002@pacs.sunbelt.net>,
<1994May26.163844.2422@mixcom.mixcom.com>, <1994May26.193748.6333@cs.brown.edu>
Subject : Re: CW speed? When will the wingers stop ??

In <1994May26.193748.6333@cs.brown.edu> md@maxcy2.maxcy.brown.edu (Michael P. Deignan) writes:

>In article <1994May26.163844.2422@mixcom.mixcom.com>,
> kevin jessup <kevin.jessup@mixcom.mixcom.com> writes:

>|> This hobby is no longer concerned with advancing the state of the
>|> radio art. I doubt if it ever was.

>Where have you been. We're not interested in advancing the state of the
>radio art, we're simply interested in increasing the number of amateurs
>(to sell more upgrade materials, ARRL memberships, and oh, "protecting
>spectrum (cough, gasp, wheeze)).

>I don't know if advancing is a valid concern of the amateur service
>anymore anyway. Electronics technology today is filled with surface
>mount tech and custom ICs. Not much amateurs can do in those areas.

Yes. Let's all admit it. We cannot keep up with advancing technology. We ALL are just appliance operators. Therefore, CW is the saving grace and "FILTER" to keep the idiots out. After all, why study theory? We can't keep up anyway, right? Therefore, CW to the rescue. Up that code speed. Pound the brass. Unbelievable! We ADMIT we are behind the times so rather than trying to change our ways and adapt to and

embrace new technology, we become a historical society.

```
--
/`- _      kevin.jessup@mixcom.com | Vote Libertarian!
{      }/
\      /      N9SQB, ARRL, Amateur Radio | Call 1-800-682-1776
|__*|      N9SQB @ WA9POV.#MKE.WI.USA.NA | for more information.
```

Date: Thu, 26 May 1994 22:40:08 GMT
From: ihnp4.ucsd.edu!swrinde!emory!kd4nc!ke4zv!gary@network.ucsd.edu
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <1994May13.094820.2335@hncr.tufts.edu>,
<5+vvNWb.ndfriedman@delphi.com>, <2rstru\$glp@char2.vnet.net>
Reply-To : gary@ke4zv.atl.ga.us (Gary Coffman)
Subject : Re: Code test speeds

In article <2rstru\$glp@char2.vnet.net> exe02594@char2.vnet.net (exe02594) writes:
>Neil D. Friedman (ndfriedman@delphi.com) wrote:
>: Jerry Dallal <jerry@hncr.tufts.edu> writes:
>:
>: >(2) [I need help on this one.] I thought it was *required* by international
>: >treaty. I say 'thought' because I don't know how the no-Code Tech class
>: >is able to coexist along with these requirements.
>:
>: There is no international requirement for a code test above 30 MHz.
>
>OK - then please explain how CB is legal?

CB isn't amateur radio, neither is AM broadcasting. You can get an
AM broadcast license without passing a Morse exam and that's below
30 MHz too.

>Also - what is the international code requirement - in wpm?

There isn't one. The treaty says that applicants shall demonstrate
that they can "send by hand and receive by ear texts in the International
Code". That's it, no speed requirements at all.

>Isn't a lot of the resistance to dropping the code requirement
>the "Tree House Syndrome" (Now that I climbed up here - I want
>to pull up the ladder - or at last remove every other rung.
>(quaver switch) You are going to put an elevator WHERE????
>(quaver switch)

Yep.

Gary

--

Gary Coffman KE4ZV		You make it,		gatech!wa4mei!ke4zv!gary
Destructive Testing Systems		we break it.		uunet!rsiatl!ke4zv!gary
534 Shannon Way		Guaranteed!		emory!kd4nc!ke4zv!gary
Lawrenceville, GA 30244				

End of Ham-Policy Digest V94 #224
